

**REMARKS**

The Office rejects claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11, objects to claims 4 and 10, and allows claims 12-14 in the subject application. Claims 1, 2, and 4-14 (3 independent claims; 13 total claims) remain pending in the application.

Support for the various amendments may be found in the originally filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. §102 REJECTIONS**

The Examiner rejects claims 1-3, 5-9, and 11 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Levesque (U.S. Patent No. 5,422,608, issued June 6, 1995 owned by Texas Instruments Incorporated). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Levesque discloses an adaptive transmission line termination with a FET 34 (which operates as a variable control resistor). In Levesque, the resistance of a variable controlled resistor 16 is varied depending on the half voltage appearing on transmission line 10 in order to match the characteristic impedance of transmission line 10 (for the series or source termination case). For the parallel termination case, the resistance of FET 34 is varied depending on the voltage appearing at the input of gate 14 to match the characteristic impedance of transmission line 10.<sup>1</sup>

But, as conceded by the Examiner, Levesque fails to teach, advise, or suggest "the terminating resistor short circuits between the pair of differential lines" as recited in claims 1 and 8 (and claims 2, 5-7, 9, and 11, which variously depend from claims 1 and 8).

In the Examiner's statement of reasons for indication of allowable subject matter, the Examiner states that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the teaching of Levesque to further include the terminating resistor short circuits between the pair of differential lines. No where does Levesque teach, advise, or suggest this missing claimed element.

---

<sup>1</sup> Levesque, Abstract.

Thus, Levesque fails to teach, advise, or suggest one or more of the claimed limitations, so that claims 1, 2, 5-9, and 11 are patentable over Levesque.

Also, since Applicant has canceled claim 3, the rejection of this claim is moot. Finally, since claims 4 and 10 now depend from allowable claims, these claims are also patentable.

### **CONCLUSION**

Thus, the Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is thus requested. Applicant invites the Office to telephone the undersigned if he or she has any questions whatsoever regarding this Response or the present application in general.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8-25-05

By: S. Shahpar  
Shahpar Shahpar  
Reg. No. 45,875

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
One Arizona Center  
400 East Van Buren  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-2202  
Phone: (602) 382-6306  
Fax: (602) 382-6070  
Email: [sshahpar@swlaw.com](mailto:sshahpar@swlaw.com)